

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA
11

12 LINCOLN BENEFIT LIFE COMPANY,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 JENNIFER DIEGUEZ et al.,

16 Defendants.

17 CASE NO. 3:22-cv-05305-DGE

18 ORDER ON MOTION FOR
19 EXTENSION OF TIME FOR
20 SERVICE OF PROCESS

21 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Lincoln Benefit Life Company's Motion
22 to Extend Deadline for Service of Process. (Dkt. No. 7.) Plaintiff filed this interpleader action
23 on May 3, 2022, seeking a declaration confirming the Mark D. Johnson's changes to his life
24 insurance policy were valid and allocations should be made to the named beneficiaries. (Dkt.
25 No. 1 at 3.) Plaintiff seeks this declaratory relief against Defendants Jennifer Dieguez and Joel
26 Johnson, the Personal Representatives of the Estate of Mark D. Johnson, as well as Denise
27 Johnson, Melanie Love, Janelle Johnson, Melissa Boyer, Ryan Johnson, and Frances Hauser.
28 (*Id.* at 1.)

1 Plaintiff claims to have served five named Defendants—Melanie Love, Frances Hauser,
2 Melissa Boyer, Diane Johnson, and Janelle Johnson. (Dkt. No. 8 at 2.) Plaintiff did not serve
3 Defendants Ryan Johnson, Joel Johnson, and Jennifer Dieguez “because the parties settled in
4 principle before service occurred.” (*Id.*) On August 1, 2022, the day service was due, Plaintiff
5 filed a Motion to Extend the Deadline for Service of Process until September 30, 2022, pursuant
6 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). (Dkt. No. 7 at 1.) Defendants did not respond, and the
7 matter is now ripe for consideration.

8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides, if a plaintiff shows good cause for their
9 failure to serve a defendant within 90 days after the complaint was filed, “the court must extend
10 the time for service for an appropriate period.” In this case, Plaintiff seeks an extension because
11 the parties have agreed to a settlement in principle but “require additional time to finalize and
12 memorialize their settlement and the accompanying documentation as required.” (Dkt. No. 7 at
13 2.) Accordingly, the Court finds good cause for a 60-day extension of the deadline for service of
14 process. Having considered Plaintiff’s motion, and the remainder of the record, the Court finds
15 and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend Deadline for Service of Process (Dkt. No. 7) is
16 GRANTED.

17 Plaintiff shall serve Defendants Ryan Johnson, Joel Johnson, and Jennifer Dieguez no
18 later than September 30, 2022.

19
20 Dated this 18th day of August 2022.

21
22 
23 _____
24 David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge